

**VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING
SPECIAL BOARD for a
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN/LOCAL WATERFRONT REVITALIZATION
PLAN**

**Minutes
Meeting of February 28, 2013
At VFW on Kemble Avenue**

Present: Mike Armstrong, Chair; Anne Impellizzeri, Vice-Chair; Members: Karen Doyle, Marie Early, Cathryn Fadde, Stephanie Hawkins, Michael Reisman, Dick Weissbrod

Absent: Anthony Phillips

Also Attending: Michele Greig, GreenPlan

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:38 pm.

Remarks of Chair

Mike Armstrong distributed a financial statement showing expenditures to date, projected expenditures, projected income (Greenway grant). He stated \$6,668 remains available from the DOS grant for consulting services; \$750 has been allocated for legal services (it has not yet been billed), and \$704 has been expended for other fees (advertising, room rental, etc.). A portion of the DOS funds have to be deferred to the end of the project work (DOS reimburses on the completed percentage of the project); the Greenway grant money will be used to pay for expenses during the next few months. The Village has signed a Memorandum of Understanding with Greenway; the Greenway signatures are expected within the next few weeks at which time the Greenway funds will be available for use by the Special Board. Anne Impellizzeri pointed out that the Greenway funds were obtained by the SB to strengthen the LWRP including sea level rise and climate change.

Armstrong distributed a document describing "Climate Smart Communities" from the DEC; this was suggested by Kristin Marcel in her presentation in January – she said that there is grant money available for engineering studies, for example, for Climate Smart Communities. Armstrong asked if the SB felt that Cold Spring should recommend to the Village Board that Cold Spring should apply to become a Climate Smart Community, and suggested that this should be evaluated sooner rather than later since the issue is before the Village Board now. There was discussion on this. Dick Weissbrod volunteered to look into this as it would potentially also affect the Planning Board; Dick will report on his research at the next meeting.

Armstrong reported that at the Feb. 28 Village Board meeting, developer Paul Guillaro asked that all issues be put on the table (including all boards in the Village) relating to his Butterfield development that are not part of the public record, so that he can be aware of all thinking about the project. Armstrong asked SB members to think

about this for discussion at the next SB meeting. Although there was sentiment among SB members that this was not appropriate for the SB to do, the discussion was deferred to the next meeting.

Minutes, Jan. 17, Jan. 31, and Feb. 14, 2013

Weissbrod made a motion to approve the minutes from Jan. 17, 2013. The motion was seconded by Karen Doyle and approved unanimously (Cathryn Fadde, Impellizzeri and Michael Reisman abstained since they were not present at the Jan. 17 meeting).

Impellizzeri made a motion to approve the minutes from Jan. 31, 2013. The motion was seconded by Fadde and approved unanimously (Reisman and Weissbrod abstained since they were not present at the Jan. 31 meeting).

Weissbrod made a motion to approve the minutes from Feb. 14, 2013 as amended. The motion was seconded by Impellizzeri and approved unanimously (Doyle, Fadde and Reisman abstained since they were not present at the Feb. 14 meeting).

Report of Planning Board Liaison

Weissbrod had nothing to report. .

Franchise/Formula Business/Drive Thru Report Changes Discussion

Stephanie Hawkins distributed the most recent draft of the Formula Business/Drive Thru report; Armstrong distributed a version of that draft showing the specific changes. Hawkins spoke to each of the changes and the reason for the changes. Comments were made. Marie Early made a motion to approve the report as amended for presentation to the Village Board. Fadde seconded the motion which was approved unanimously. The SB gave Hawkins a round of applause for her work on this report.

Discussion on Drafted Policies

Draft Policies 10.6, 11, and 13 were discussed with Michele Greig. Clarifications were provided by Michele, changes were recommended. There was not sufficient time to review/revisit Policy 1; this was deferred to the next meeting.

Land Use Section: Discussion

Michele said that ideally, the CP would have a chapter on future land uses. However, she felt that that would be a big undertaking to amend the CP to add such a chapter and she didn't feel it was absolutely necessary. She recommended an approach for the LWRP which would make it consistent with the CP or with the existing zoning. She said there is a lot in the CP in support of the land use recommendations in the LWRP. Some of the recommendations in the LWRP are very specific as to the zoning changes and how they could/should be implemented; she would recommend those not be included in the LWRP but rather be phrased relative to the uses of the land/property/area. (For example, if there is a non-conforming commercial building in a residential area, the LWRP should say something like "the commercial use should be allowed to continue"). Armstrong asked Michele if she was suggesting using the LAWU section from the LWRP and removing some detail, and she agreed that that is what she was recommending, couching it in the context of land uses. Armstrong asked if the maps would be included in the LWRP? She recommended looking at the existing (current) LAWU map and compare it to the Future Land and Water Use map (both from the LWRP), identifying any changes that had been made from the current map which are reflected in the future map. Then, it would need to be determined if the future (new) use has a basis in the current Code or in the CP. If the new use does not have a basis in the current Code or in the CP, this would require an amendment to the CP. An analysis of these changes could potentially describe these changes as land use, not zoning. Early volunteered to compare the maps identifying the differences, and then send this list to the SB. The SB members would review the differences list, make any corrections, highlight any that are not adequately rooted in the CP and identify any that would require a zoning amendment. The total documentation would then be sent to Michele who would then generate the verbiage focusing on land uses to accompany the differences for potential inclusion in the LWRP. Impellizzeri pointed out that Jaime has said that the one thing that is required is a consistency law.

Inventory and Analysis update

Armstrong had circulated the latest version of the Inventory and Analysis section in Word format. He asked that SB members review the document and be prepared to discuss it on March 28. He would like to get photos and graphics included in the document so that it is complete as possible, to be ready for the March 28 review. Michele reported that Jaime Ethier has provided some suggestions which Armstrong will forward. Michele suggested getting input from the DEC and the EPA on the Marathon and Boat Club discussions in the document. Reisman will follow up on Marathon with someone at the EPA, asking if the section in the LWRP is accurate. Impellizzeri asked if there isn't someone at DEC with whom we could follow up on the Boat Club. Armstrong noted that it is difficult because the situation regarding the MGP is in flux. Members were asked to review the I&A and be prepared to discuss it at the next meeting. Please send any changes to Armstrong prior to the next meeting.

Michele will not attend the March 14 meeting.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

Adjournment

Early made a motion to adjourn. This was seconded by Fadde and unanimously approved. Meeting adjourned at 9:39 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Marie Early, Secretary

Signed,

Mike Armstrong